



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,746	07/26/2001	Yajun Guo	532732000101	1834

30542 7590 05/09/2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
P.O. BOX 80278  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278

EXAMINER

CANELLA, KAREN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1643

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/915,746

Applicant(s)

GUO ET AL.

Examiner

Karen A. Canella

Art Unit

1643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 4 and 7-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2, 3, 5 and 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/27/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on Jan 27, 2006 has been entered.

Claim 2 has been amended. Claims 1-18 are pending and under consideration.

### *Specification*

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the Cross-Reference section of the specification fails to mention that the instant application is a CON of 09/451,353..

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 7 is drawn to an antigen, characterized in that said antigen is specifically bound by the monoclonal antibody produced by the hybridoma deposited under ATCC Accession No. HB-

12588, and wherein said antigen is present on the membrane and in the cytoplasm of human melanoma cells but not present in normal, non-activated human melanocytic cells and non-melanocytic human tumor cells in an amount which is detectable by said monoclonal antibody. Thus, the claimed antigen is characterized only by functional attributes, (binding to the antibody, and presence on the surface of a specific cell type) because the structure of the epitope bound by said antibody cannot be inferred from the deposited hybridoma, and the epitope may in fact be a three dimensional epitope not dependent on a linear peptide sequence.

Claims 1 and 4 are drawn to monoclonal antibodies which specifically bind to the above antigen, and hybridomas thereof. It is noted that claim 1 does not require that the claimed antibodies specifically inhibit the binding of the monoclonal antibody produced by the deposited hybridoma, HB-12588, and thus the claims read on monoclonal antibodies which bind to different epitopes than that bound by the antibody produced by the deposited hybridoma,

Claims 8-17 are method claims reliant on the identity of the antigen characterized only by binding to the monoclonal antibody produced by the deposited hybridoma, and the expression pattern of the antigen, as stated above.

The instant claims lack adequate written description because the antigen to which the antibodies bind, lacks adequate written description. The characterization of said antigen relies only on the functional attributes of the antigen, without related these functional attributes to structural requirements.

Although drawn to DNA arts, the findings in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997) and *Enzo Biochem, Inc. V. Gen-Probe Inc.* are relevant to the instant claims. The Federal Circuit addressed the application of the written description requirement to DNA-related inventions in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The court stated that "[a] written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, 'requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name,' of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials." *Id.* At 1567, 43 USPQ2d at 1405. The court also stated that a generic statement such as "vertebrate insulin cDNA" or "mammalian insulin cDNA" without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the genus from others, except by function. It does not specifically

define any of the genes that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the gene does, rather than what it is. *Id.* At 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406. The court concluded that "naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material." *Id.*

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Natali et al (British Journal of Cancer, 1995, Vol. 71, pp. 1243-1247) as evidenced by Trefzer et al (BMC Cancer, 2006, Vol. 6, pages 1-12, reference of the IDS submitted Jan 27, 2006).

Natali et al disclose fibronectin isoforms in melanocytic lesions. Trezer et al disclose that monoclonal antibody SM5-1 (which is identical to the antibody produced by the deposited hybridoma of the instant invention), recognizes a fibronectin variant which is widely expressed in melanoma and not confined to metastatic melanoma (page 6 of 12). Natali et al fulfill the specific embodiment of "enriched antigen" as the sample of cells exhibiting the fibronectin variants constitute an enriched antigen, relative to another sample of cells wherein the melanoma cells were present at a lower density and therefore the antigen would be present at a lower density and would be less enriched than the sample of cells disclosed by Natali et al. Claim 7 does not require that the antigen be separated from the cell.

Claim 2, 3, 5 and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

Art Unit: 1643

claim and any intervening claims.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen A. Canella whose telephone number is (571)272-0828. The examiner can normally be reached on 11 am to 10 pm, except Wed, Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on (571)272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Karen A. Canella, Ph.D.

4/28/2006

  
KAREN A. CANELLA PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER